

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-27478

Proposal: An infill building addition with projecting and marquee dynamic signs and loading dock modifications

Applicant: MacDonald & Mack Architects

Address of Property: 300 1st Avenue North & 123 3rd Street North

CPED Staff: Janelle Widmeier, Senior City Planner, 612-673-3156

Date Application Deemed Complete: January 30, 2013

Public Hearing: February 26, 2013

Appeal Period Expiration: March 8, 2013

Ward: 7 **Neighborhood Organization:** Downtown Minneapolis Neighborhood Association

Concurrent Review: If the certificate of appropriateness application is approved for the project as proposed, the project will also require Planning Commission approval for the following land use applications:

- Conditional use permit for four dynamic signs.
- Variance to increase the maximum number of dynamic signs from one to four.
- Variances to increase the maximum height of the dynamic signs from 14 feet to 15 feet for the marquee signs and to 28 feet for the projecting sign.
- Variances to increase the maximum allowed size of two dynamic signs from 32 square feet to 47.7 square feet for the projecting sign and to 218.68 square feet for one of the marquee signs.
- Variances to allow flashing lights on each dynamic sign.
- Variance to reduce the minimum loading requirement (no on-site loading will be provided).
- Site plan review.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27478

CLASSIFICATION	
Local Historic District	Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District (contributing resources)
Period of Significance	1865-1930
Criteria of Significance	Events, Architecture, Architect
Date of local designation	1978
Date of National Register listing	1989
Applicable Design Guidelines	<i>Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District Design Guidelines</i> <i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties</i> <i>Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs and Awnings</i>

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Current name	300 1 st Avenue North & 123 3 rd St N (Colwell Building)
Historic Name	Langdon Building & Fur-Tex Building
Current Address	314 1 st Avenue North
Historic Address	300-312 1 st Avenue North & 113-129 3 rd Street North
Original Construction Date	1887 & 1909
Original Architect	W.H. Dennis & Long, Lamoreaux and Long
Original Builder	R.B. Langdon & H.N. Leighton Co.
Historic Use	The existing structures were used as warehouses. A salt shed and a surface parking lot occupied the space between the two buildings.
Current Use	Offices, commercial uses, and a surface parking lot
Proposed Use	Nightclub

BACKGROUND:

The Langdon Building is an impressive five-story brick and stone warehouse designed in the Richardsonian Romanesque Style with elaborate terra cotta ornamentation and finely detailed brickwork. The square building features two principal six bay facades with emphasis on a prominent corner pavilion with ornate terra cotta shield. The first and second stories contain large window areas which are framed by round brick arches resting on stone piers. The arches are decorated with a terra cotta mold which includes snarling lion heads and foliated designs. A decorative letter “L” in a foliated circle also appears. The upper stories are organized by brick pilasters which extend beyond the roofline of the building. The cornice consists of a series of semi-circular corbelled arches and the parapet contains recessed brick panels and further terra cotta ornamentation.¹ The building retains high levels of integrity.

The Langdon Building was originally owned by Robert Bruce Langdon and leased for many years to the George R. Newell Company. Newell came to Minneapolis in 1866 and soon entered the grocery business. In 1870, he became a partner in the firm of Stevens, Morse and Newell, a wholesale grocery firm. After a succession of partners, the firm became the George R. Newell and Company in 1882. For years the company occupied a building at 9, 11, and 13 Washington Avenue North, but in 1881 moved to Washington and First Avenue North only to again outgrow their quarters and move to the large warehouse at 300 1st Avenue North. In 1923 the firm expanded its facilities and built a warehouse at 601 North 3rd Street, also within the Warehouse District. The George R. Newell Company eventually became the Super Value Chain.¹

The eight-story Fur-Tex Building is designed in the Renaissance Revival Style and features terra cotta and deep wine-colored brick. The principal facades are defined by a tri-part horizontal division between the heavy masonry of the first floor, the tall middle section of the building, and the attic. The corner bays of the symmetrical building feature single window units with formalized surrounds. The remaining double hung windows are arranged in pairs. A flared cornice in terra cotta completes the building.¹ With the exception of the first story, the original sash has been retained. The building retains its integrity.

The alley on this block retains its original right-of-way width (16 feet) and retains its integrity. The width of the alley is significant as it retains the historic relationship between the buildings and landscape features of the district. Original materials may be located below the alleyway's current pavement. Loading docks, canopies, and fire escapes are significant features of alleys in the district; as landscape features of the warehouse/industrial complex and the way it evolved, they help to convey the significance of the district.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL:

A four-story infill addition is proposed between the buildings located at 300 1st Avenue North and 123 3rd Street North. A nightclub is proposed. The proposed use will also occupy areas of the 123 3rd Street North building. The flat-roofed building addition would be 62.5 feet tall at the top of the parapet wall and as viewed from 3rd Street North. The proposed exterior materials include brick of two different sizes and colors, architectural precast stone, aluminum windows with clear and tinted glass, and steel hanger doors.

¹ Rolf Anderson, Minneapolis Warehouse District NRHP Nomination 1989

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27478

Four signs are proposed. A 52 foot wide marquee, which would extend 7 feet 8 inches from the building, would contain three of the signs. The name of the establishment would be attached to the front of the marquee. On each end of the marquee, a dynamic sign displaying both full color graphics and text is proposed. A projecting sign displaying the name of the establishment is proposed above the marquee. The signs with the name of the establishment would be illuminated with face-mounted bulbs and neon. Bulbs located on the letters of the signs would randomly scintillate at a rate of approximately one beat for every 1.5 seconds. Bulbs located on the borders of the signs would shadow chase at a rate of about one foot per second. The border lighting would also contain LED light strips.

Three new loading dock doors facing the alley are proposed on the 123 3rd Street North building. One of the doors would infill an existing opening. The loading dock would be extended 8.5 feet for a second opening. Adjacent to the loading dock extension, ground-level double entry doors would be added.

The applicant has provided sample materials and colors, which will be available for viewing at the public hearing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

As of the writing of this report, staff has received no public comment on the project.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Findings as required by the Minneapolis Preservation Code:

The Minneapolis Department of Community Planning and Economic Development has analyzed the application based on the findings required by the Minneapolis Preservation Ordinance. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:

- (1) The alteration is compatible with and continues to support the criteria of significance and period of significance for which the landmark or historic district was designated.**

The Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District is historically significant as an area of commercial development during the early growth of the city and the region. The district is also architecturally significant for its concentration of commercial buildings designed by the city's leading architects in styles that evolved from the Italianate Style of the 1860s to the curtain-wall structures of the early twentieth century. The changes to the property will not affect its historical significance. However the proposed changes may affect its integrity (i.e. the property's ability to communicate its historical significance), as discussed in finding #3 below.

- (2) The alteration is compatible with and supports the interior and/or exterior designation in which the property was designated.**

As discussed in findings #4 and #5, the proposed alterations would be compatible with and support the properties' designation with the adoption of the staff recommendation.

(3) The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued integrity of the landmark or historic district for which the district was designated.

Both the City of Minneapolis' Heritage Preservation Regulations and the National Register of Historic Places identify integrity as the authenticity of historic properties and recognize seven aspects that define a property's integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. With the adoption of the staff recommendation, the proposed work would impact but not impair the integrity of the district.

Location: The applicant is not proposing to change the location of the structures, thus the project will not impair the landmark's integrity of location.

Design: The infill design reflects the singular rectangular forms of buildings in the historic district and would have a defined base, middle and top. The addition would not affect the character defining walls of the adjacent buildings nor would it exceed their height. Parts of the first floor building wall would be set back up to 4 feet from the lot line adjacent to 3rd Street North to accommodate openings. The upper floors of the street facing façade would be built up to the property line except at the edges where the proposed curtain walls would be set back approximately 3 feet. Although recessing the upper floors from the public right-of-way is not characteristic of this district, the proposed setback would keep the primary materials of the adjacent buildings exposed where they wrap the corners. A simple rectangular fenestration pattern with inset windows and doors is proposed. Although continuous vertical bands of windows are not considered appropriate in this district, the side curtain walls along with the large curtain wall on the front façade speaks to the mostly open space between the two buildings that has likely existed since they were constructed. Architectural details that have been incorporated into the building design do not try to replicate those of the historic buildings.

The animated changeable sign messages and use of flashing lights would have a substantial impact on the integrity of design. The proposed signage is characteristic of the Hennepin Avenue entertainment area, but not of the Warehouse Historic District.

The proposed loading dock changes to the rear of the 123 3rd Street North building would not have a substantial impact on the integrity of design. Records indicate that loading functions have traditionally occurred on this side of the building, but the loading dock does not appear to be established during the period of significance.

Setting: The applicant is not proposing any modifications that would have an impact on the integrity of setting.

Materials: On the infill addition, the proposed exterior materials include medium and dark brick of two different sizes as the primary materials with a dark brown mortar, limestone-colored architectural precast stone with matching mortar for accent trim, aluminum windows and doors with clear and tinted spandrel glass and medium brown and red frames, and medium brown steel hanger doors. With the exception of the tinted glass, these materials are appropriate. The textures of these materials are complimentary to other buildings in the district. The colors are also complimentary, although darker tones for the door and window frames would be more appropriate.

On the alley side of the 123 3rd Street North building, dark brown steel doors are proposed. Concrete would be used to extend the loading dock. Many of the openings have been filled in and doors have been replaced over time. However, the applicant has not identified if original brick will be affected with the new doors.

Aluminum, painted black, would be used for the sign and marquee cabinets.

Workmanship: The addition and alterations would not result in the loss or alteration of any distinct decorative or character defining elements on the building and would not have an impact on the integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The proposed alterations would not substantially impact the feeling of the building.

Association: The proposed alterations would not have a substantial impact on the integrity of association.

- (4) **The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the applicable design guidelines adopted by the commission.**

The Heritage Preservation Commission adopted the *Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District Design Guidelines* in 2010. These Guidelines pertain to the infill construction and loading dock alterations.

Infill construction: The proposed building design is consistent with most of the applicable guidelines. The design guidelines for building additions to the side of existing buildings and the design guidelines for new buildings on infill sites are attached to this report. The design guidelines included below address areas of the project that deviate from these guidelines.

Street wall - Building Placement on Site:

Requirement:

- 3.1. The building shall be built to the property line adjacent to the public right-of-way (zero setback). A maximum setback of five feet is allowed for recessed entryways.

Massing:

Requirement:

- 3.21. Building facades or portions of facades that are stepped back along street facing facades are not allowed.

Other Considerations:

- 3.22. Building facades or portions of facades that are stepped back will be considered if the proposed massing for the overall buildings is demonstrated to be compatible with the design of surrounding historic buildings within the district. The proposed massing shall be superior in design to the required singular rectangular volume.

Staff comment: Parts of the first floor building wall would be set back up to 4 feet from the lot line adjacent to 3rd Street North to accommodate openings. The upper floors of the street facing façade would be built up to the property line except at the edges where the proposed curtain walls would

be set back approximately 3 feet. Although recessing the upper floors from the public right-of-way is not characteristic of this district, the proposed setback would keep the primary materials of the adjacent buildings exposed where they wrap the corners.

Scale:

Requirement for Twentieth Century Warehouse:

- 3.26. The first floor height shall be between 14 and 21 feet and upper story height between 10 and 14 feet.

Staff comment: Adjacent to the street building façade, the proposed height of the first floor (measured floor to floor) would be 12.5 feet. The second floor (mezzanine level) would also be 12.5 feet tall. The separation of floors above the mezzanine level is not apparent from the exterior because a curtain wall is proposed. Different brick and window patterns are proposed on the base (first and mezzanine levels) and upper levels of the building. The design difference creates a perception of a taller first floor. Requiring a taller first floor would likely impact the placement of the marquee. Marquees are generally not located higher on building facades.

Fenestration – Windows:

Requirements:

- 3.43. Clear glass or non-reflective low emission glass or coatings shall be used.
3.44. Continuous horizontal or vertical bands of windows shall not be allowed.

Advisory:

- 3.45. Real single or double hung windows at regular intervals, and in a size and number that compliments the building are appropriate (see Fenestration- Building Envelope: guidelines 3.37 and 3.38)
3.46. The appropriate height to width proportion of individual windows is 4:1 to 3:1.
3.47. Twin windows or two windows separated by a minimum 4 inch wide mullion within a window opening are appropriate.
3.48. Commercial style divided light and contemporary interpretations of this style are appropriate.

Staff comment: Bronze tinted glass is proposed in the vertical bands of windows at the edges. Clear glass in the vertical bands along with the large curtain wall on the front façade would speak to the mostly open space between the two buildings that has likely existed since they were constructed. Tinted glass would not be appropriate. Staff is recommending that glazing is required to be clear.

Although the proposed windows do not conform to the first three advisory guidelines, they are a commercial style divided light that is a contemporary interpretation of theater windows.

Materials:

Advisory:

- 3.71. Having one principal facade material and color on primary (street facing) facades and another material or color for secondary (non-street facing) facades is appropriate.
3.72. One color is appropriate per building facade and one secondary color is appropriate for accents, trims and details.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27478

- 3.76. Appropriate trim colors for door frames, window frames handrails and external metal features, are black, and dark tones of blue, red, brown, or green.

Staff comment: On the street facing façade, two bricks of different sizes and colors are proposed as the primary façade materials. Adjacent to the street building façade, the proposed height of the first floor (measured floor to floor) would be 12.5 feet. The second floor (mezzanine level) would also be 12.5 feet tall. The separation of floors above the mezzanine level is not apparent from the exterior because a curtain wall is proposed. Different brick and window patterns are proposed on the base (first and mezzanine levels) and upper levels of the building. The design difference creates a perception of a taller first floor.

The colors proposed for the door and window frames are medium brown and red. They would be complimentary to the proposed materials, although darker tones for the door and window frames would be more appropriate for the district. Staff is recommending that darker tones be used.

Loading dock: The following guidelines apply to the proposed loading dock alterations:

Requirements:

- 1.11. Loading docks and canopies dating from the period of significance shall be preserved and retained.
- 2.18. Replacement mortar shall duplicate the original mortar's composition, color, texture, joint width, and joint profile.
- 2.19. When patching an area of historic brick wall, the new brick and mortar shall match the original brick and mortar in material, color, profile, dimension, and texture.
- 2.37. Original loading dock doors, which were typically overhead or sliding, shall be maintained when feasible. Filling the opening with glass or another treatment that preserves the wall opening will be considered.
- 2.56. Loading docks and their associated canopies shall be preserved. Their location, height, width, and length shall be retained.

Staff comment: The alterations are proposed to a secondary façade. Records indicate that the loading dock and canopy were not constructed until after 1950, but the existing canopy will be retained and concrete will be used for the expansion of the loading dock. One of the door openings appears to be original. From the plans it appears that new openings will be created for the other two doors. No original doors will be replaced. Dark brown metal doors are proposed. The plans do not identify specifics for the brick or mortar to be used where the openings will be for the new doors. Staff is recommending that the brick and mortar shall duplicate the original brick and mortar's composition, profile, dimension, color, texture, joint width, and joint profile and existing brick shall be reused if possible.

Signage and marquee: In the *Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District Design Guidelines*, there are no specific guidelines that pertain to signage or marquees. The Heritage Preservation Commission adopted the *Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs and Awnings* in 2003. The following guidelines apply to this proposal (because there are not specific guidelines for signs located on marquees, the guidelines for wall signs have been included below for comparison purposes):

1. *In General:*

- a. *Sign message:* All signs, except window signs, real estate signs, project information signs, auxiliary signs, temporary signs and portable signs, are limited to the name and address of the establishment.
- c. *Number of signs:* Each principal building entrance that faces a public street, or each ground floor principal use, whichever is less, is allowed two signs. The two signs may be a combination of one wall sign, one projecting sign, one ground sign, one banner, and awning signage. Only one of the signs should be illuminated, except that banners and awning signs should never be illuminated.
- d. *Location of building signs:* Wherever possible, signs should be placed in traditional sign locations including the storefront sign band area. Signs should not obscure or damage architectural features including windows, doors, pilasters, columns and historic signs. Building signs should be located only on the primary façade of the building adjacent to the street and should be no higher than fourteen (14) feet, except as otherwise provided in the specific guidelines for wall signs.
- e. *Color:* Sign colors and materials should be compatible with the colors of the building and its surroundings. Day-glo, light reflecting or fluorescent colors or materials are not allowed.
- g. *Illumination:* Signs may be illuminated externally, internally, or by neon. All illuminated building signs should connect to a permanent mounting plate located near the entrance. Electrical conduit should be installed through the permanent mounting plate.

2. *Sign Types Allowed:*

- a. Wall signs.
- b. Projecting signs.
- g. Marquee signs, on theaters only.

3. *Sign Types Not Allowed:*

- o. Animated signs.
- p. Flashing signs.
- q. Changeable copy signs, except on a theater marquee or ground sign.

4. *Guidelines for Specific Types of Signs:*

- a. *Wall Signs:*
 - i. Location. Wall signs should be located between the first and second floor and should not be higher than fourteen (14) feet, except where the historic sign band is higher. Wall signs should not conceal architectural features or obstruct openings.
 - ii. Size. Wall signs should be no more than two (2) feet high and thirty-two (32) square feet in area and should not extend outward from the building more than eight (8) inches.
 - iii. Materials. Wall signs may be constructed of wood, metal, painted fiberglass or painted plastic.
 - iv. Installation. Wall signs should be attached to the building through the mortar joints. If illuminated, a wall sign should be placed adjacent to or over a permanent mounting plate for electrification. Electrical conduit and lighting fixtures should be attached to the top of the wall sign, and should not be attached to the building. Wall signs should

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27478

not be painted directly on the surface of the building, except as part of the maintenance or restoration of an existing historic sign.

b. *Projecting Signs:*

- i. Location. Projecting signs should be located near a building entrance and should not be higher than fourteen (14) feet. Projecting signs should not conceal architectural features or obstruct openings, and should not be suspended from the soffit.
- ii. Size. Projecting signs should be no more than twelve (12) square feet in area and should not project more than four (4) feet from the building. The thickness of a projecting sign should not exceed eight (8) inches.
- iii. Materials. Projecting signs may be constructed of wood, metal, painted fiberglass or painted plastic.
- iv. Installation. Projecting signs should always use a single permanent mounting plate.

The proposed use is similar to a theater use; therefore, allowing a marquee is reasonable. There is not guidance for appropriate placement, material or size of new marquees. The placement of the marquee is situated between the first floor and the mezzanine level and would not block any windows. Although the height of the marquee would interrupt the taller first floor height of the adjacent buildings, marquees are generally not located higher on building facades. Based on the material guidelines for other signs, a metal marquee would be appropriate. The marquee would be 52 feet wide, 4 feet tall, and project 7 feet 8 inches from the building. The bulk of the marquee may be out-of-scale for this district. Staff is recommending that the applicant consider shortening the width of the marquee to approximately 36 feet in width while keeping it aligned over the entrance doors.

In determining whether to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for a sign proposal, special situations, including building condition, building orientation, historic precedence and exceptional design proposals, can be considered. The proposed sign messages, number, illumination, size, height, and types of signs would deviate from the above guidelines.

- o *Sign messages:* The dynamic signs located on the ends of the marquee would not be limited to the name and address of the establishment. Each dynamic display screen would be 17.7 square feet in area and would contain full-color graphics and text. Changeable copy signs (not animated) can be appropriate for theater signs; however, animated and flashing signs are not appropriate. Staff is recommending that the messages on the displays are limited to text.
- o *Number of signs:* Four signs are proposed. Because a marquee is allowed for a theater use, allowing a sign on each side of the marquee is reasonable.
- o *Illumination:* All four signs would be illuminated. This is typical of a theatre signage. However, flashing lights are not characteristic of this district. Staff is recommending that the signs not be allowed to scintillate or shadow chase.
- o *Size:* The wall sign guidelines were applied to the marquee signs for analysis. Both of the dynamic signs on the end of the marquee would be less than 32 square feet in area. The area of the letters on the front of the marquee would be 40 square feet. The projecting sign would be almost 48 square feet in area with a one foot thickness. The size of both of these

signs is compatible with the scale of the infill addition. Historic photos (attached to this report) indicate that larger signs were installed on the buildings in the district after the period of significance. For example, a photo of the Fur-Tex Building from 1956 shows a projecting sign exceeding 12 square feet in area on the 3rd Street North building wall. Allowing larger signs on the infill addition would indicate that the infill addition was established after the period of significance.

- *Height:* The wall sign guidelines were applied to the marquee signs for analysis. With the top of the marquee located 15 feet above grade, the signs attached to it would be slightly more than 14 feet in height. The projecting sign would be located above the marquee and would extend to 28 feet above grade. Historic photos (attached to this report) indicate that larger signs were installed on the buildings in the district after the period of significance. For example, a photo of the Fur-Tex Building from 1956 shows a projecting sign on the 3rd Street North building wall that was approximately 36 feet above grade. Allowing larger signs on the infill addition would indicate that the infill addition was established after the period of significance.
- *Types of signs:* The bulbs on the signs would randomly scintillate or shadow chase. The dynamic signs on the ends of the marquee would contain full-color graphics and text and would be animated. The proposed signage is characteristic of the Hennepin Avenue entertainment area, but not of the Warehouse Historic District. Allowing flashing signs and animated signs would not be appropriate. Staff is recommending that flashing, including scintillation and shadow chasing, and animated signs not be allowed.

(5) The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the recommendations contained in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Loading dock: The following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are most applicable to the proposed loading dock alterations:

1. *A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.*
2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
5. *Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

The alterations proposed are to allow the change of the use of the building, but would not significantly affect its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. It appears that loading functions historically occurred from the alley. The proposed alterations would be made to secondary facades with little or no visibility from the street. The plans do not identify specifics for the brick or mortar to be used where the openings will be for the new doors. Staff is recommending that the brick and mortar shall duplicate the original brick and mortar's composition, profile, dimension, color, texture, joint width, and joint profile and existing brick shall be reused if possible.

Infill construction and signage: The following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are most applicable to the proposed infill construction and signage:

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - *Destruction of Historic Materials and Features:* The infill construction and signage would not cause any destruction to the significant building walls of the existing buildings. To tie the infill construction into the 123 3rd Street North building, parts of the interior building wall would be removed. This is not a primary building wall.
 - *Destruction of Spatial Relationships:* The edges of the front façade would be recessed to prevent altering the corners of the existing buildings where the significant materials wrap the corners. Clear glass in the vertical bands along with the large curtain wall on the front façade would speak to the mostly open space between the two buildings that has likely existed since they were constructed.
 - *Differentiating the New Work From the Old:* The materials, fenestration patterns and signage would differentiate the new work from the old.
 - *Compatibility with Historic Materials:* The proposed materials and colors are generally consistent with those appropriate for the district. However, tinted glass is not appropriate. Also, darker tones for the door and window frames would be more appropriate for the district.
 - *Compatibility with Historic Features, Size, Scale, Proportion and Massing:* The infill design reflects the singular rectangular forms of buildings in the historic district and would have a defined base, middle and top. The addition would not affect the character defining walls of the adjacent buildings nor would it exceed their height. Parts of the first floor building wall would be set back up to 4 feet from the lot line adjacent to 3rd Street North to accommodate openings. The upper floors of the street facing façade would be built up to the property line except at the edges where the proposed curtain walls would be set back approximately 3 feet. Although recessing the upper floors from the public right-of-way is not characteristic of this district, the proposed setback would keep the primary materials of the adjacent buildings exposed where they wrap the corners. A simple rectangular fenestration pattern with inset windows and doors is proposed.

Although continuous vertical bands of windows are not considered appropriate in this district, the side curtain walls along with the large curtain wall on the front façade speaks to the mostly open space between the two buildings that has likely existed since they were constructed. Architectural details that have been incorporated into the building design do not try to replicate those of the historic buildings.

The animated changeable sign messages and use of flashing lights would have a substantial impact on the integrity of design. The proposed signage is characteristic of the Hennepin Avenue entertainment area, but not of the Warehouse Historic District.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

The proposed alterations would be made to secondary facades where significant features would not be affected. Future removal of the alterations should not significantly impair the essential form and integrity of the historic buildings.

- (6) The certificate of appropriateness conforms to all applicable regulations of this preservation ordinance and is consistent with the applicable policies of the comprehensive plan and applicable preservation policies in small area plans adopted by the city council.**

According to the principles and policies outlined in the comprehensive plan, *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*, the following apply to this proposal:

Historic Preservation Policy 8.1 Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture.

8.1.1 Protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance.

8.1.2 Require new construction in historic districts to be compatible with the historic fabric.

As conditioned, the project will not modify the building in ways that are insensitive to its historical character and new construction would be compatible with the historic fabric, as discussed in findings #3, #4 and #5 above.

- (7) Destruction of any property. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves the destruction, in whole or in part, of any landmark, property in an historic district or nominated property under interim protection, the commission shall make findings that the destruction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the destruction. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to, the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses. The commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the property a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.**

The project does not involve the destruction of the property. Primary and character defining facades would not be affected.

Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings that alterations are proposed in a manner that demonstrates that the Applicant has made adequate consideration of the following documents and regulations:

- (8) Adequate consideration of the description and statement of significance in the original nomination upon which designation of the landmark or historic district was based.**

Other than aspects of the proposed signage, the project indicates sensitivity toward the property's ability to communicate historical significance.

- (9) Where applicable, Adequate consideration of Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, Site Plan Review.**

The City Planning Commission will review the project for compliance with Chapter 530 Site Plan Review standards. The applicant has taken into consideration these standards and will be requesting alternative compliance for the first floor window requirements for a wall facing a street. Windows located in doors do not count towards meeting the minimum zoning code window requirements.

- (10) The typology of treatments delineated in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the associated guidelines for preserving, rehabilitating, reconstructing, and restoring historic buildings.**

With the adoption of the staff recommendation, the project complies with the rehabilitation guidelines of *the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* as discussed in finding #5 above.

Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves alterations to a property within an historic district, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:

- (11) The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued significance and integrity of all contributing properties in the historic district based on the period of significance for which the district was designated.**

The Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District is historically significant as an area of commercial development during the early growth of the city and the region. The district is also architecturally significant for its concentration of commercial buildings designed by the city's leading architects in styles that evolved from the Italianate Style of the 1860s to the curtain-wall structures of the early twentieth century. The changes to the property will not affect its historical significance. However the proposed changes may affect its integrity (i.e. the property's ability to communicate its historical significance), as discussed in finding #3 above.

(12) Granting the certificate of appropriateness will be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and will not negatively alter the essential character of the historic district.

The spirit and intent of the City of Minneapolis' Heritage Preservation Regulations is to preserve historically significant buildings, structures, sites, objects, districts, and cultural landscapes of the community while permitting appropriate changes to be made to these properties. With the adoption of the staff recommendation, granting of the application will be in keeping with the intent of the ordinance and will not negatively alter the essential character of the historic district.

(13) The certificate of appropriateness will not be injurious to the significance and integrity of other resources in the historic district and will not impede the normal and orderly preservation of surrounding resources as allowed by regulations in the preservation ordinance.

The request might set a precedent for future cases, but will not formally authorize changes to other landmarks, historic districts, or properties under interim protection without staff or HPC review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt the findings above and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness to allow an infill building addition with projecting and marquee dynamic signs and loading dock modifications for the property located at 300 1st Avenue North and 123 3rd Street North, subject to the following conditions:

1. On the 123 3rd Street North alley facing wall, any replacement brick and mortar shall match the original brick and mortar in material, color, profile, dimension, and texture. Original brick shall be reused where possible. Mortar shall duplicate the original mortar's composition, color, texture, joint width, and joint profile.
2. Darker tones of red or brown shall be used for the door and window frames.
3. Glazing shall be clear. Low E and other energy-efficient glazing is acceptable.
4. Messages on the dynamic signs shall be limited to text.
5. Sign and marquee lighting shall not flash (scintillate or shadow chase).
6. The applicant shall consider shortening the width of the marquee from 52 feet to approximately 36 feet in width while keeping it aligned over the entrance doors.
7. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of two years from the date of the decision unless required permits are obtained and the action approval is substantially begun and proceeds in a continuous basis toward completion. Upon written request and for good cause, the planning director may grant up to a one year extension if the request is made in writing no later than February 26, 2015.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27478

8. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this Certificate of Appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed. Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.
9. Department of Community Planning and Economic Development staff shall review and approve the final plans and elevations prior to building permit issuance.

Attachments:

- *Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District Design Guidelines* for building additions to the side of existing buildings and the design guidelines for new buildings on infill sites
- Applicants project description and statement addressing the applicable Certificate of Appropriateness findings
- Photographs with notations by applicant
- Zoning map
- Plans
- Building material specifications
- Sign specifications
- Renderings
- Current context photographs
- Historic context photographs